

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL

Case No. **CV 22-3887-JFW(PDx)**

Date: September 12, 2022

Title: Jesse Graham -v- Cable News Network Inc.

PRESENT:

HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Shannon Reilly
Courtroom Deputy

None Present
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:

None

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:

None

PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS):

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE ISSUED AND WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO NOTIFY COURT OF RELATED CASE

The Court has reviewed the dockets in this action, *Jesse Graham v Cable News Network Inc.*, Case No. 22-3887-JFW (Pdx) ("Graham II"), and *Jesse Graham v. Cable News Network Inc.*, Case No. 21-7417-MCS (AGRx) ("Graham I"), and concludes that the Complaints filed in the two cases are identical.¹ In addition, Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, filed *Graham II* after *Graham I* was dismissed with prejudice by Judge Mark C. Scarsi and while Plaintiff's appeal in *Graham I* was pending.² However, despite having filed two identical actions and in an apparent effort to avoid the transfer of *Graham II* to Judge Scarsi, Plaintiff failed to file a Notice of Related Cases as required by Local Rule 83-1.3.1. In addition, Plaintiff falsely answered "NO" in response to Section IX(a) Identical Cases of the Civil Cover Sheet, which asks "[h]as this action been previously filed in this court?"³ Local Rule 83-1.3.1 provides in relevant part:

It shall be the responsibility of the parties to promptly file a Notice of Related Cases whenever two or more civil cases filed in this District:

¹ The only difference is that Plaintiff did not attach the exhibits to the Complaint in this action.

² Plaintiff's appeal in *Graham I* was ultimately dismissed for failure to prosecute.

³ Plaintiff also falsely answered "NO" in response to Section IX(b) Related Cases of the Civil Cover Sheet, which asks "[i]s this case related (as defined below) to any civil or criminal case(s) previously filed in this court?"

- (a) arise from the same or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;
- (b) call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or
- (c) for other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

...

The Notice of Related Cases must include a brief factual statement that explains how the cases in question are related under the foregoing factors. All facts that appear relevant to such a determination must be set forth.

The Notice must be filed at the time any case . . . appearing to relate to another is filed, or as soon thereafter as it reasonably should appear that the case relates to another.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is ordered to show cause, in writing, no later than **September 19, 2022** why the Court should not impose sanctions in the amount of \$1,500.00 and/or dismiss this action for failure to file a Notice of Related Cases as required by Local Rule 83-1.3.1 and for falsely answering the questions on the Civil Cover Sheet. No oral argument on this matter will be heard unless otherwise ordered by the Court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; Local Rule 7-15. The Order will stand submitted upon the filing of the response to the Order to Show Cause. Failure to respond to the Order to Show Cause will result in the imposition of monetary sanctions and the dismissal of this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.